DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 384 997 EA 026 898

AUTHOR Lugg, Catherine A.
TITLE Schools and Achieving Integrated Services: Facilitating Utilization of the Knowledge Base.
PUB DATE Oct 94
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration (Philadelphia, PA, October 28-30, 1994).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Agency Cooperation; At Risk Persons; Community Coordination; Community Resources; Cooperative Planning; Cooperative Programs; Elementary Secondary Education; Organizational Effectiveness; *Partnerships in Education; *Program Implementation; *Shared Resources and Services; *Social Services

ABSTRACT

Coordinated social services may be one of the most promising aspects of the current era of systemic educational reform. However, moving from a policy that calls for coordinated service integration into the actual practice of providing services requires the resolution of a host of complex, interacting issues. This paper provides an overview of what is known about service-integration projects and discusses how this knowledge can be used. A conclusion is that service integration is a highly complex, labor intensive, and dynamic process that also tends to be site specific. Several general models exist. "Collaboration" represents the high end of involvement and intensity for groups developing a service-integration alliance, with "coordination" at the midpoint, and "cooperation" representing the lowest level of involvement. Project scope is usually either statewide or local. During the implementation and dissemination stages of a service-integration project, participating agencies, schools, and communities should be aware of immediate issues such as staff development and role definition, and the larger contextual issues of turf, marketing, and financing. Collaborative efforts are most vulnerable to disintegration during the implementation stage. Sustained efforts by all stakeholders are needed for success. Contains 39 references. (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 384 997

SCHOOLS AND ACHIEVING INTEGRATED SERVICES: FACILITATING UTILIZATION OF THE KNOWLEDGE BASE

Catherine A. Lugg
Educational Theory and Policy Studies
The Pennsylvania State University

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EA 026 898

Prepared for delivery at the University Council for Educational Administration Convention, October 1994, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E. Lugg

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SCHOOLS AND ACHIEVING INTEGRATED SERVICES: FACILITATING UTILIZATION OF THE KNOWLEDGE BASE

Catherine A. Lugg

The Pennsylvania State University

Coordinated social services may be one of the most exciting aspects of the current era of systemic educational reform. However, moving from a policy that calls for coordinated service integration into the actual practice of providing services requires the resolution of a host of complex issues, that while fragmented, do interact. Additionally, the social service delivery system itself is greatly fragmented. As O'Day and Smith explain, "Fragmentation of the current policy system serves as a major obstacle to educational improvement from either the top down or the bottom up" (in Fuhrman, 1993: 266). How do participating social and educational agencies and their respective personnel resolve the varying aspects of turf issues? How do the agencies involve different stakeholders, engage in team building, coordinate and implement financial and budgetary agreements? And how do they negotiate the complexities of client confidentiality, and provide technical assistance, which in turn, are supposed to positively impact the dynamic and changing social environment of children's lives? As a recent Council of Chief State School Officers report observed:

> Simply inviting state staff to meetings or sending out written policy guidance is not in and of itself, sufficient to assist with the difficult process of change. For technical assistance to be effective, we have found it needs to [be] intensive, ongoing, and responsive to the needs of ... agency staff (1993:4)

The issue at hand for many service integration projects is that of dissemination and implementation; of making the transition from the ideals of the coordinated plans to a daily reality within the schools, whether service delivery actually occurs on campus or not. This is more problematic that it seems at first blush, due to the highly specific context from

which these plans evolve. While a highly detailed model of service integration might provide some psychic comfort for schools, participating agencies, communities, and the personnel involved, it may not be particularly helpful in the long run. After observing the development of school-linked, community-based, and school-based services for over a decade, Joy Dryfoos has observed, "Clearly, no one model has emerged as the way to build more comprehensive service systems" (Dryfoos, 1994:145). Yet again for public schools, there appears to be no "one best system" (Tyack, 1974) in which to proceed.

Additionally, while involving the schools more intensively with social services is a fairly recent development for the current generation of educators and administrators, American communities are familiar with its antecedent, the Settlement House Movement of the Progressive Era, ca. 1890 - 1917 (Tyack, 1992; Dryfoos, 1994). The impetus to connect various social services to the public schools is well over a hundred years old. While some of the dynamics have obviously changed, there are enough important similarities between the two eras that the lessons from the Progressive era should not be summarily dismissed. Both the Progressive and current (perhaps neo-Progressive?) eras recognized that American children, particularly urban children, were "at-risk" of disease, hunger, dropping out, delinquency, etc. Reform minded educators, community leaders, parents, health care workers and government officials issued a rallying cry and began to explore various ways to reduce in Schorr's terms "rotten outcomes" (Schorr, 1988). Innovations such as playgrounds, (or the highly touted night-basketball), school-based health clinics, and year round schools were developed and offered as possible remedies to the current social ills. And finally, in both eras, many plans, agreements and programs were, and still are, highly sensitive to the larger and always shifting political and fiscal winds. In many, many respects, the move to more intimately involve the schools in service delivery represents a form of "back to the future" in social policy. For public school

educators and administrators, information gleaned from both eras may provided insights in moving from "what do we know" to "how can we use what we know."

What Do We Know?

Actually, we know a lot. To begin with, the term "at-risk" has been at times an ambiguous classification and there are some valid critiques regarding its rather haphazard and indiscriminate use (see Winfield, 1991:5). The term implies that a given student is not only at-risk for academic failure and other educational disadvantages (Nettles, 1991:379) but they are also at-risk of teenage pregnancy, developmental delay, suicide, drug use, etc. Teamed with the concept of at-risk is the notion of *resilience*, or the ability of an individual child to adapt and/or overcome factors that may place them in jeopardy. While much of the research regarding "at-risk" children has focused on why so many of them fail, few researchers have explored why any of these children succeed given the overwhelming odds they face (Rhodes, Brown, 1991:2; see also Wang, Gordon, 1994). There has also been a tendency by some researchers to engage in "drive-by" ethnographies, detailing much of the immediate pain and horror that at-risk children face, but providing little long-term contextual analysis. The "drive-bys" tend to obscure the phenomenon that "although a certain percentage of children in high-risk circumstances developed psychopathologies, a larger percentage did not develop disorders and became healthy and competent adults" (Wang, Haertel, Walberg, 1994:47-48).

Be that as it may, resilient or invulnerable children usually possess the following characteristics:

> (1) favorable personality characteristics, (e.g. such as high self esteem and self control, and internal locus of control, positive mood, social responsiveness, and flexibility); (2) a supportive family milieu that encourages and facilitates coping efforts; and (3) warm, supportive social environment that encourages and reinforces coping attempts (Fine, Schwebel, 1991:21).

The notion of resilience or invulnerability holds enormous implications for educators, social service personnel, policy makers, and the larger community. According to Lisabeth Schorr

> ...disastrous outcomes are much more likely when several risk factors interact. ...it means that rotten outcomes can be changed through action on several fronts. Not everything must be changed for something to be accomplished. Not every factor that causes adverse outcomes must be removed before their incidence can be reduced (Schorr 1988:24).

Resilient children are not anomalies (see Hauser et. al., 1989:111), squeaking past the dismal odds through sheer dumb luck. Nor are they instant mythic-heroic characters from some contemporary Horatio Alger tale, overcoming impossible life situations through old-fashioned American pluck. While resilient children might have been overlooked by many social service researchers in the past, they have been lionized by those who would claim that their success was due solely to their individual and intrinsic moral virtue. This has fueled the ideological flames of those who wish to abolish any notions of planned and coordinated assistance, i.e., help that is from outside the immediate family unit (for example, see Murray, 1984).

The reality is that resiliency is a fluid phenomenon, highly dependent upon complex environmental factors, and how these factors may or may not interact with each other. E. Virginia Demos points out that resiliency "does not function uniformly and automatically, but waxes and wanes in response to contextual variables" (1989:4). To be blunt, resources do make an important and at many times, the critical difference. Additionally, those institutions designed to deliver social services to children, matter. In fostering resiliency, there are incentives (programmatic, fiscal and social ecological) for education and social service agencies, and community groups, to work together to better life outcomes for all children, since resiliency is very sensitive to the degree and type of external supports that are available for both children and their families.

The objectives involved in building the resilience of children generally include (1) reducing the overall levels of vulnerability and risk, such as hunger, lack of immunization and the like; (2) reducing stressors and pile-up, for example, the emotional fall-out from divorce; (3) increasing the resources available to provide for these services, and (4) activating the protective process (Rutter, 1987, Masten 1994, Rhodes, Brown, 1991). The movement to better outcomes and foster resiliency for children at risk has spurred schools, social agencies, the federal, state and local governments, and various community groups and their members, to come together in offering a variety of social services. There are a plethora of demonstration projects underway across the US, employing a variety of strategies and types of service delivery. While there is no one specific model that can describe service integration projects, an examination of current programs reveals that there are commonalties among the various schemes from which several models can be drawn.

First, most projects tend to fall into either the school-linked, school-based, or community based categories (Behrman, 1992; Dryfoos, 1994). Yet there is disagreement regarding which type of offering is the most effective form of service coordination (Crowson and Boyd, 1993:2). The community-based approach is not directly linked to schooling, and the school is very much at the periphery of the action. Not only is the school not <u>the</u> central stakeholder, it is not even <u>a</u> central player. The school provides "coordination with and referral to community agencies" (Dryfoos, 1994:124). The school-linked services approach ties the schools more tightly to various social service agencies, but the service offerings remain off-campus. The last type is the school-based approach, with a variety of social service agencies working together to provide integrated services on campus. The rationale for basing service integration projects at the school site follows the "Willie Sutton" model (i.e. that's where the children are).

Secondly, service integration projects, alliances, or collaboratives fall into one of two categories regarding their breadth: (1) Projects that are fairly comprehensive and involve numerous state, county and local agencies, and may also include a number of private agencies, foundations, universities and/or colleges. These projects are then targeted to serve a population throughout a given state or municipality. (2) Projects that are more modest, for example an alliance that is focused upon an individual school, involving only a few agencies and outside interests. These less ambitious projects tend to be site-specific and serve a narrowly targeted population of students and their families (Crowson, Boyd 1993:14-15).

A brief overview of the pertinent literature reveals that the terms collaboration, coordination, and cooperation are sometimes used rather indiscriminately and interchangeably, with collaboration being the most popular "buzz" word. Barbara Intriligator has placed these three terms on a continuum, each representing the degree of interorganization participation and effort (1992). In her model, collaboration implies a high level of interagency participation, interdependence and effort; coordination represents moderate levels; and cooperation represents a low level of interorganization participation and effort, and a high degree of agency and school independence.

William Swan and Janet Morgan have designed a somewhat similar model regarding interagency efforts. While they are concerned with developing interorganizational alliances to better serve young children with special needs, they provide tremendous insight into the overall issues. In contrast to Intriligator's conceptualization, their model follows more of a dynamic or developmental sequence, (which follows Gray's notion of collaboration, see Gray, 1989), with cooperation standing at the core or center, with the level of participation increasing and flowing outwards toward coordination, and

collaboration serving as the final and most complex stage of a multi-organizational alliance (Swan, Morgan, 1993:20).

From the literature, there is some agreement that at the most rudimentary level of an interorganizational alliance is the notion of *cooperation*. Cooperation between various organizations is usually viewed as a short-term arrangement, with participating groups working together to achieve a very narrow goal (Intriligator, 1992). They usually do not form a interagency council, nor do they allocate funds for a specific budget account. This does not imply that resources are not allocated, it is just that they are funnelled through each agency's and school's budgetary process (Hord, 1981:13). Cooperative alliances that are formed between organizations and their respective personnel function on an informal and somewhat infrequent basis. It tends to favor community-based programs (Dryfoos, 1994). This type of effort is usually only a minor aspect of the involved organization's overall business, and it "represents a superficial level of agency interaction" (Swan, Morgan, 1993:21).

Service *coordination*, on the other hand, serves as the mid-point of the interorganizational participation/effort continuum, or developmental sequence (Intriligator, 1992, Swan, Morgan, 1993). The various participating groups relinquish a certain degree of institutional autonomy, in that they form a separate interagency council that is task(s) specific. However, unlike a collaborative, the level of group and individual interaction is much lower and tends to be more informal. Schools and social service agencies typically retain their own institutional prerogatives, and share resources and information in a limited manner. Coordination projects tend to favor a school-linked approach (Dryfoos, 1994). Decision making regarding the scope and direction of the coordination effort are made within the framework of the interagency council (Swan, Morgan, 1993). Finally, participating groups tend to retain separate budget accounts, but may choose to create a

separate budgetary account for the development and maintenance of the interagency council.

Collaboration represents the most complex and intricate of interorganizational alliances. *Collaboration*, as defined by Swan and Morgan represents

> efforts to unite organizations and people for the purpose of achieving common goals that could not be accomplished by any single organization or individual acting alone (1993:19).

Collaboration, as defined by Barbara Gray is

> a process through which parties who see different aspects of a problem can constructively explore their differences and search for solutions that go beyond their own limited vision of what is possible (1989:5).

Collaboration, *as a process* that involves differing agencies and organizations, demands a high degree of interdependence, between not only the various administrators, but also between the assorted front-line human service personnel (Mawhinney, 1993:11). Organizations involved in collaborations typically share autonomy and resources, decision making and leadership (Swan, Morgan, 1993:22). Additionally, a separate and specific budget may be established to finance the formation of an interagency council to oversee the collaboration effort. Collaborative alliances usually involve some formal administrative and communication procedures between agencies, schools, community groups, and their respective personnel (Hord, 1986). Building strong lines and maintaining frequent communication is critical to the collaborative's success. Collaborative alliances are usually involved in offering school-based services (Dryfoos, 1994). Finally, the most distinguishing feature of collaboratives is that the participating groups typically are working on *complex, long term projects*, that involve multiple tasks.

According to Swan and Morgan, there are eight basic assumptions present when various organizations build a collaborative. They are:

- 1. One agency agency alone cannot provide al' of the services.

- 2. With limited resources and categorical focus, agency programs must coordinate efforts to avoid waste, unnecessary duplication, and service gaps.

- 3. There is nothing to be gained by competition. The agency providing the service is not as important as the fact that the child and family are appropriately served.

- 4. The differences across agency programs represent a strength-not a weakness or problem to be eliminated.

- 5. The service delivery system must consist of a wide variety of options from which families may choose.

- 6. Agency programs are "equal" in importance.

- 7. Agencies must provide mutual support and assistance to one another.

- 8. A structured system of interagency collaboration must exist (Swan, Morgan, 1993:15-17).

The federal government has also been examining service integration projects to develop a possible model. It has been concerned with the most intensive form of service delivery, collaboration. In Together We Can, a policy document developed jointly (but perhaps not collaboratively), by the US Department of Health and Human Services, and the US Department of Education, a five stage process of building collaboration for comprehensive family services is laid out. The steps include 1) getting together, 2) building trust, 3) developing a strategic plan, 4) taking action, and 5) going to scale (Melaville, et. al., 1993:20).

Regardless of what model is followed, modified, or whether a model is developed independently by participating agencies and their respective personnel, one of the major appeals of a comprehensive service integration project is that of economies of scale. Bringing a host of social service agencies and public schools together across a state to better serve children certainly has a ring of efficiency to it. Ideally, greater numbers of potential clients can be served and tight agency budgets can be stretched. However, the

involvement of a multitude of agencies across a variety of localities can make the actual process of collaboration quite cumbersome, possibly tilting it from a client driven, service deliverer designed and maintained operation, to that of a hierarchical, top-down approach. The sheer size and complexity of a comprehensive project may build this inherent contradiction into the overall scheme, perhaps thwarting the eventual goals.

On the other hand, a modest approach typically serves far fewer students and involves only a handful of agencies. While the goals may seem more attainable, modest projects are especially sensitive to budgetary constraints. Additionally, the fact that fewer students are served may limit the overall visibility of the project, which in turn can adversely affect future funding. However, modest projects tend to be less hierarchical in design, and tend to be much more flexible in their approach to service delivery.

Ultimately, the purpose of any service integration approach is to strengthen resiliency in the quest to reduce the potential of "rotten outcomes." Happily, given the growing research on children and resiliency, there are specific things that schools, communities and social service agencies can do, to foster better life-time outcomes for children "at-risk." Working together is one of those "things."

How Can We Use What We Know?

No matter what service integration approach is eventually employed, the actual dissemination and implementation process for achieving such services is highly labor intensive (Cunningham, 1990). According to Barbara Grey, the implementation of any collaborative venture involves dealing with various constituencies, building external support, structuring, and monitoring the agreement and ensuring compliance (1989:57). She goes on to caution that it is during the implementation stage of the process that agreements are vulnerable to collapse (1989:92). This observation is further bolstered when viewing evidence f[illegible] school-based projects. According to Dryfoos:

> It is important to understand the difficulty in creating new institutions and in convincing entrenched bureaucrats to change their ways and share authority and decision making. Program developers should be aware of raising expectations and devising overly ambitious constructs that topple from the weight of unrealistic structures (1994: 149).

Some authors have claimed that "planning is implementation" (Gardner 1992:86). While strong and careful planning can facilitate both dissemination and implementation, and good dissemination and implementation blurs the line between "planning" and "dissemination and implementation," the distinction between these two broad areas should remain. Planning is fundamentally oriented towards tomorrow, while dissemination and implementation are intimately involved with what is happening today. The question for planning is "Will the project work?" while dissemination and implementation is concerned with "Are our plans working?"

For public schools, there are some general observations of how any change is implemented. According to Michael Fullan, there are six interactive themes involved when schools embark on change. They are: implementation–leadership and vision, evolutionary planning, initiative-taking and empowerment, staff development and assistance, monitoring/problem-coping, and restructuring (1991:88). Not only do these six work together, they can at times work at cross purposes. It is critical that these themes work together for change to occur.

Additionally, implementation of any reform effort "necessitate(s) a re-conceptualization of the roles and responsibilities of teachers and administrators, as well as a rethinking of the relationships that bind them together" (Murphy, 1991:35). Or to put more bluntly, any integration project will include staff development as a major component of that implementation. The words "staff development" can elicit groans from both teachers and administrators long used to "one-shot workshops on 'hot' topics that are unrelated to each other" (Fuhrman, 1993:7). But it is part of the larger systemic change process needed

to foster service integration. As Cunningham notes, service integration "imposes new demands on individual professionals and institutions. New skills are required" (Cunningham, 1990:15). After examining district-university partnerships, Michael Fullan has developed one such strategy.

> The goal is to design and carry out a variety of activities that make the professional and staff development continuum a reality, and that link classroom and teacher development with school development by coordinating and focusing the efforts of the districts and the universities. Classroom management, cooperative learning strategies, coaching, mentoring, collaborative work cultures, management of change at the school level, and coordination, coherence, and consistency at the district and university levels characterize the activities of the consortium.(1991:321-322)

While schools engaged with service integration are being redefined, there are three broad and interactive areas that have a critical impact upon schools and agencies in the implementation of a integrated social services project. They are Turf, Marketing, and Financing. The most problematic and complex organizational concern may well be that of "turf," or of overlapping and sometimes conflicting agency, professional, and civic group boundaries (Crowson, Boyd, 1993). This issue must be resolved in the process of building trust and consensus for the interorganizational alliance to be effective (Clark, 1991). "Turf" must also be negotiated between clients and participating groups, and clients and the umbrella organization (Lugg, Boyd, 1993). The parameters involved with an integrated alliance are very fluid, and changing events for individuals, clients and participating organizations demand that the alliance must be re-negotiated from time to time.

One issue related to turf is the notion of de-centering. Depending on the type of interorganizational alliance and style of service delivery, the school will probably not be the central player. In some instances, such as community-based services, it may not even be a central player. While the school is an obvious stakeholder in the drive for better outcomes, the notion that the school as an institution could be possibly be moved from the center of

the social equation to an equal partner with other agencies that work with children may be disconcerting. According to Dryfoos:

> The more comprehensive the program, the more likely that existing school personnel might feel undermined by the new effort. School-employed guidance counselors, social workers, and psychologists also feel bypassed when their counterparts are brought into schools by outside organizations.(1994:155).

As already noted, an integrated approach to foster resilience will necessitate role redefinition for school personnel, and these roles might be in a process of on-going redefinition.

A second issue facing both schools and the larger interorganizational alliance is that of marketing, or of "selling" the integration project not only to the personnel, students and parents involved, but to the broader public. Service integration projects are not without political controversy, and this is especially true for the school-based projects. The ideal of school-based health care can quickly be transformed into "condom distribution in our school," by detractors. Coordinated services invites political controversy because first, the public schools by definition are political institutions, and secondly, it spurs a change in political philosophy, from the notion of the "state of families," where the parents have the final say regarding their children, to the "family state," where the state could possibly have the final say (see Gutmann, 1987). American social traditionalists, in particular, see the expansion of social service provision for children as a state usurpation of the family domain (Lugg, in-progress). As Dryfoos notes

> In many states, the greatest obstacle to introducing or expanding school-based service programs has been opposition from those who claim that such programs are only providing contraceptives and abortions or promoting sexual activity among teenagers. Such opposition can be difficult to overcome, especially when it emanates from the governor or powerful interest groups (1994:184).

It would behoove any interorganizational alliance to be pro-active in anticipating political controversy. The mission and short-term and long-term goals of the alliance must

be clearly stated and broadly disseminated. Utilization rates and outcome evaluations can also be employed to garner political support. The goal of marketing the alliance is to clearly define what the project is about (better long-term outcomes for children) before someone else does it for the alliance.

There is also historical precedent for being pro-active. Many of the Progressive-era school-based social service integration projects fell victim to shifting political winds immediately after the First World War, thanks to the Red Scare. What was once labeled "Progressive" was redefined as "Socialist," placing social reformers and their hard fought reforms perpetually on the defensive.[1] Funding for the more ambitious and extensive school-based programs evaporated. Given the volatile nature of reform, and the political dynamics of securing funding, "selling your program to the public" is critical to its maintenance and continuation.

Related to the issue of marketing is that of financing the alliance, or the question of "Who Pays?" Regardless of the type interorganizational alliance that organizations wish to pursue, how the alliance is actually funded can be critical to the overall shape and mission. Establishing financial linkages between the participating organizations can provide the glue to build and then maintain the alliance. Many projects, however, are in a transition stage. As Dryfoos explains.

> The most urgent question raised by advocates of full service schools is how to finance them after the demonstration grants run out. In the case of foundations, the funding period is typically three to five years–they support demonstration projects, not public services. Governors and legislators go in and out office and programs follow, making uncertain the longevity of state grants as well. In any case, administrators are eager for old programs to find long-term financing so that state funds can be moved to imitative new programs. No state has committed the amount of funds necessary to develop and maintain a system of school-based service centers for families

[1]For example, an interesting editorial from a 1918 NEA Journal is entitled "Why we aren't Soviets."

> and children in every community that needs one. The last group of RWJ (Robert Wood Johnson) grantees were warned to prepare for the end of their six-year programs (1994: 172).

Michael Kirst (1993) has noted that there are federal funds available that can be employed for greater social service provision. Melaville, et. al., (1993) also mention that there is a variety of federal aid available, and they list three differing sources:

> 1) Education - Chapter 1 and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (P.L. 101-476);
>
> 2) Health - Medicaid, Title XIX of the Social Security Act, Early Periodic Screening, Diagnosis and Treatment Service (EPSDT), and Title V of the Social Security Act Maternal and Child Health Block Grant;
>
> 3) Social Services - Title IV-E of the Social Security Act, The Family Support Act of 1988, Title XX Social Services Block Grant, The Child Care Development Block Grant, and The Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Block Grant (Melaville, et. al., 1993:84-85).

States and municipalities have also provided funds for service-coordination projects. These sources, however, are rather sensitive to local economic and political conditions, and can be severely curtailed in times of recession or political turbulence (Dryfoos, 1994). It takes consistent efforts by the service integration alliance to build political support, something that may not be immediately achieved. Noting the sensitivity of state and local funding, Swan and Morgan list the following possible nonprofit and private sources.

> 1) Nonprofit Community Agencies, 2) Hospitals, Clinics and Rehabilitation Centers, 3) Private Practitioners, 4) United Way Agencies, 5) Volunteer Organizations, 6) Parent Groups, 7) Foundations and Nonprofit Organizations, 8) Community and Civic Groups, 9) Private Business, 10) Universities, Community Colleges, and Vocational Programs, and 11) Institutes and Research Centers (1993:214-216).

The actual financing of an interorganizational alliance can be a rather sticky business (Swan, Morgan, 1993:134-135). There are many institutional disincentives for participating, perhaps the most notable arising when conducting cost-benefit analyses.

While interorganizational alliances may save money for society as a whole in the long-run, an individual organization may see their expenditures rise, and rise dramatically, with little or no tangible results. This may have been been the case with the demise of the Pew Project (see Cohen, 1994). Projected savings may well show up in a different agency's budget, and be realized years later. For example, according to Sylvia Hewlett

> If children are to do well ...every politician and business leader needs to know that $1 spent on preschool education saves $4.75 in remedial education, welfare, and crime control (1991:29).

Using systemic thinking (and Hewlett's example), to view the levels of expenditure, one can explain what has happened with the various agencies' costs. While the costs for early childhood education have increased, long term expenditures for social remediation have been reduced, and reduced rather dramatically. However, these savings are usually not seen using cost-benefit analysis methods tied to a 3-, 5-, or even 10-year evaluative cycle.

Deciding exactly how the alliance should be financed, and which agency realizes what savings, is highly context dependent, and it can be an arduous and time consuming process. Additionally, getting all the stakeholders to come to agreement, and to maintain the agreement as fiscal years pass by, takes consistent commitment of the part of all the stakeholders. Finally, political support at both the state and local levels must be courted and maintained for integrated services to become part of the larger cultural and social landscape. Otherwise, it may well be "back to future" yet again, with contemporary social service integration and attempts to foster resiliency for children at-risk following the path of Progressive-era reforms more closely than its proponents ever envisioned.

Conclusion

The desire to better long-term outcomes for children at-risk has generated a multitude of projects that attempt to integrate service offerings across various social

agencies', public schools' and community groups' institutional agendas. Additionally, there has been the growing realization that "[t]he current fragmentation across children's services represents a fundamental failure to confront the comprehensive needs of children, youth, and adults" (Kirst, McLaughlin, 1990:69). This movement has also been bolstered by the growing research examining resilience, or the ability to cope with adversity. The realization is that social resources matter, and agencies, public schools, and communities can work together is a systemic fashion to strengthen the resiliency of at-risk children. As Boyd observes:

> ...factors associated with students and their families, and with the community and society in which they live, also have to be addressed in any comprehensive approach to our educational problems, and especially in the case of disadvantaged students (1991:85).

However, service integration itself is a highly complex, labor intensive, and dynamic process which also tends to be site specific. While no single model of service integration has emerged, or is likely to emerge, there are several general models that provide insight and guidance into the overall process. Collaboration represents the high-end of involvement and intensity for groups developing a service integration alliance, with coordination the mid-point, and cooperation representing the lowest level of involvement. Additionally, the breadth of projects tend to fall into one of two categories, either state-wide or local projects.

During the implantation and dissemination stages of a service integration project, participating agencies, schools and communities should be aware of immediate issues such as staff development and role definition, and the larger contextual issues of turf, marketing and financing. It is during this state, the stage of "making it all work," where Gray cautions that the collaborative efforts are subject to fall apart. For public schools to make the leap with other agencies and community groups into social service integration, sustained efforts by all of the stakeholders will be needed.

REFERENCES

Behrman, R.E. (ed.) (1992, Spring). *School-Linked Services.* The Future of Children, 2 (1).

Boyd, W.L (1991). *What Makes Ghetto Schools Work of Not Work?* in School Leadership, 2, 83-129

Clark, T.A. (1991, December). Collaboration to Build Competence: The Urban Superintendents' Perspective. Office of Educational Research and Improvement, US Department of Education

Cohen, D.L. (1994, June 1). *Demise of Pew Project Offers Lessons to Funders,* Education Week, 1, 9.

Council of chief State School Officers. (1993, September). "A Strategy for Helping State Education Agencies Develop Collaborative Arrangements That Will Result in Improved Outcomes for All Young People and Their Families." A Proposal of the CCSSO to the Danforth Foundation. Washington, DC.

Crowson, R.L. (1992). School-Community Relations, Under Reform. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.

Crowson, R.L., Boyd, W.L. (1993). *Coordinated Services for Children: Designing Arks for Storms and Seas Unknown.* American Journal of Education, 101, 140-179.

Crowson, R., Boyd, W.L. (forthcoming). "Structures and Strategies: Toward an Understanding of Alternative Models for Coordinated Children's Services." In J. G. Cibulka (Ed.), Coordination Among School, Families, and Communities: Prospects for Educational Reform. Albany, NY: Suny Press.

Cunningham, L.L. (1990). *Educational Leadership and Administration: Retrospective and Prospective Views,* in Educational Leadership and Changing Contexts of Families, Communities, and Schools. B. Mitchell, L.L. Cunningham, eds. Chicago: The National Society for the Study of Education.

Demos, E.V. (1989). *Resiliency in Infancy,* in The Child in our Times: Studies in the Development of Resiliency, T.F. Dugan, R. Coles, eds. New York: Brunner/Mazel, Inc.

Dryfoos, J.G. (1994). Full-Service Schools: A Revolution in Health and Social Services for Children, Youth, and Families. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass Publishers.

Fine, M.A., Schwebel, A.I. (1991). *Resiliency in Black Children from Single-Parent Families,* in Why Some Children Succeed Despite the Odds, W.A. Rhodes, W.K. Brown, eds. New York: Praeger.

Fuhrman, S.H. (1993). *The Politics of Coherence,* in Designing Coherent Education Policy, S. Fuhrman, ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Fullan, M.G., Stiegelbauer, S. (1991). The New Meaning of Educational Change, 2nd.Edition. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

Gardener, S.L. (1992) *Key Issues in Developing School-Linked, Integrated Services.* In The Future of Children. Los Altos, CA: Center for the Future of Children.

Gordon, E.W., Song, L. D.(1994). *Variety of Resilience Experiences,* in Educational Resilience in Inner-City America: Challenges and Prospects, ed.M. Wang and E. Gordon. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Gray, B. (1989). Collaborating: Finding Common Ground for Multiparty Problems. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gutmann, A. (1987). Democratic Education. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Hauser, S.T., Vieyra, M.A.B, Jacobson, A.M., Wertlieb, D. (1989). *Family Aspects of Vulnerability and Resilience in Adolescence: A Theoretical Perspective*, in The Child in in Our Times: Studies in the Development of Resiliency, Timothy F. Dugan, Robert Coles, eds. New York: Brunner/Mazel

Hewlett, S.A. (1991). When the Bough Breaks: The Cost of Neglecting Our Children. New York: Basic Books.

Kirst, M., McLaughlin, M. (1990). *Rethinking Policy for Children: Implications for Educational Administration,* in Educational Leadership and Changing Contexts of Families, Communities, and Schools. B. Mitchell, L.L. Cunningham, eds. Chicago: The National Society for the Study of Education.

Koppich, J., Kirst, M., eds. (1993, February). *Integrating Services For Children: Prospects and Pitfalls.* Education and Urban Society. 25, (2).

Lugg, C.A., Boyd, W.L. (1993, November). *Leadership for Collaboration: Reducing Risk and Fostering Resilience.* Phi Delta Kappan. 75, (3), 253 - 258.

Lugg, C.A. (In-progress). For God and Country: Conservative Ideology and Federal School Policy During the First Term of Ronald Reagan. A Dissertation in Education. The Pennsylvania State University.

Masten, A.N. (1994) *Resilience in Individual Development: Successful Adaptation Despite Risk and Adversity.* in Educational Resilience in Inner-City America: Challenges and Prospects, ed.M. Wang and E. Gordon. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Mawhinney, H.B. (1993, April) Discovering Shared Values: A Canadian Perspective on Developing Interagency Collaboration. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta, Georgia, April 16, 1993.

Melaville, A.I., Blank, M.J. (1993, April). Together We Can: A Guide for Crafting a Profamily System of Education and Human Services. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing.

Murphy, J. (1991). Restructuring Schools: Capturing and Assessing the Phenomena. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

Murray, C.A. (1984). Losing Ground: American Social Policy, 1950 - 1980. New York: Basic Books

Nettles, S.M. (1991, Fall). *Community Involvement and Disadvantaged Students: A Review*. Review of Educational Research. 61, (3), 379-406.

O'Day, J.A., Smith, M.S. (1993). *Systemic Reform and Educational Opportunity*. in Designing Coherent Policy: Improving the System, ed S. Fuhrman. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Rhodes, W.A., Brown, W.N., eds. (1991) Why Some Children Succeed Despite the Odds. New York: Praeger.

Rutter, M. (1987). *Psychosocial Resilience and Protective Mechanisms*. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry. 57, 316-331.

Schorr, L. B.(1988). Within Our Reach: Breaking the Cycle of Disadvantage. New York: Anchor Press - Doubleday.

Swan, W.W., Morgan, J.L. (1993). Collaborating for Comprehensive Services for Young Children and Their Families: The Local Interagency Coordinating Council. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

Tyack, D. (1992, Spring), *Health and Social Services in Public Schools: Historical Perspectives*, The Future of Children, 2, (1), 19-31.

_____. (1974). The One Best System, A History of American Urban Education. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Wang, M.C., Haertel, G.D., Walberg, H.J. (1994) *Educational Resilience in Inner Cities*, in Educational Resilience in Inner-City America: Challenges and Prospects, ed.M. Wang and E. Gordon. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Winfield, L.F. (1991, November). *Resilience, Schooling and Development in African-American Youth: A Conceptual Framework*. Education and Urban Society. 24, (1), 5-14.